REMARKS

This amendment is filed with an RCE, and is responsive to the final rejection dated June 6, 2005 as well as to the Advisory Action dated October 3, 2005. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated entry of the claim amendments submitted in Amendment B (filed August 4, 2005).

Applicant particularly appreciates the Examiner's helpful discussion on the "Continuation" page of the Advisory Action. There, the Examiner discussed the contention that particular feature(s) argued by Applicant as distinguishing the claims "isn't really revealed in any of the independent claims." Therefore, by this response, Applicant has amended the claims with the guidance provided by the Examiner.

For example, the independent claims have been amended to recite "wherein said one or more optional attributes are processed by the JAVA virtual machine to optimize execution of the Java virtual machine for the particular JAVA application by controlling how JAVA runtime environment features are provided for the particular JAVA application." This is in distinction to Cyran's disclosure of optimizing the intermediate code generated from the JAVA application program.

Thus, for example, one such optimization as described in Applicant's specification (at the middle of page 8) includes "the optional attributes 210 may indicate which features of the Java runtime environment need to be loaded (i.e., only marked features are loaded)." Another example provided in the specification (also at the middle of page 8) is "the optional attributes 210 may indicate that some Java objects require special treatment at runtime (e.g., objects that remain active throughout the execution of the Java application may be allocated to a particular portion of the memory)." These particular optimizations of controlling how JAVA runtime environment features are provided for the particular JAVA applications are recited in new dependent claims, with two new dependent claims dependent on each independent claim. (See new claims 26-31.)

The Examiner has also noted in the Advisory Action that "if the optimization is done for the JAVA application program only, but not the intermediate code, it should be limited in the claims as well." While Applicant is not necessarily opposed to making such an amendment, it is not clear how such an amendment would be worded. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone should it be deemed by the Examiner that presenting such an amendment would advance the prosecution in this case.

8

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
650-961-8300

9

BEST AVAILABLE COPY